

Response to Issues – Public Submissions

80-88 Regent Street, Redfern – SSD 7080

Response to Public Submissions from exhibition of EIS (11 February 2016 to 11 March 2016) and notification of RTS (29 November 2016 to 13 December 2016)

The first 22 submissions were in response to the exhibition of the EIS. Submission No. 23 and 24 were in response to the notification of the RTS.

Submission	Resident	Particulars of Issues	Response Location
1	Unknown - Residents of both Deicota and Urba	<i>Lack of direct sunlight to all east facing apartments</i> <i>No privacy due to encroachment</i> <i>Traffic and parking issues with substantial population growth in the area</i> <i>Change of historical urban landscape in Redfern</i>	- Refer to: Sections: 4.4, and shadow diagrams in Attachment 1 Architectural Drawing Package - Refer to: Sections 4.3 and 4.8.3 and Attachment 1 - Architectural Drawing Package - This was addressed in the EIS, Attachment 5 Traffic Assessment which concluded that the proposal traffic generation arising from the future residential development of the site will have minimal impacts upon the performance of the road network. It is noted the development has adopted the constrained car parking rates contained in the SLEP 2012 to promote active forms of travel (walking and bicycle), public transport use and to minimise potential conflict with vehicle entries to the site and adjacent road network. - Addressed in the EIS, Attachment 21 Heritage Impact Statement.
2	Unknown – Redfern NSW	<i>Retention of the existing 2 storey retail facades along Regent Street.</i> <i>The removal of the facades would detract from the whole Regent Street/Botany Road retail strip. This is the intent of the 2 storey podium in the SEPP and should be retained.</i>	- The demolition of the existing shop fronts was addressed in the EIS, Attachment 21 Heritage Impact Statement which concluded the shopfronts did not warrant retention. - The proposal achieves the intent of the 2 storey podium in the SEPP - refer to Sections 4.2.2 and the Architectural Drawing Package at Attachment 1.



3	7-9 Gibbons St (Urba)	- The new development will block almost 100% of the view - Will block solar amenity to the apartment - Privacy will be impaired as there is little separation between the new development and the Urba building	- Refer to: Sections: 4.8 and Preliminary View Impact Analysis included in the Architectural Drawing Package at Attachment 1 - Refer to: Sections: 4.8 and shadow diagrams in Attachment 1 Architectural Drawing Package - Refer to Sections 4.3 and Section 4.8
4	Unknown – Redfern NSW	The loading dock could create chaos on William Lane and block access to 157 Redfern Street – the dramatic traffic increase will create a hazard to cars turning into William Lane and no traffic management solutions have been outlined	A Swept path analysis of the loading/waste bay is included at Attachment 14. Traffic generation, including along William Lane addressed in the EIS, Attachment 5 Traffic Assessment.
5	Unknown – Redfern NSW	- Concern regarding solar access for the residential properties - Don't see anything showing the reduction in solar access for these residential properties - Noise that could come from the rooftop terrace – should be restrictions concerning playing music and late night noise - Enforce building time restrictions during the building's development	- Refer to: Sections: 4.8 and shadow diagrams in Attachment 1 Architectural Drawing Package. - Refer to: Sections: 4.8 and shadow diagrams in Attachment 1 Architectural Drawing Package. - Refer to Section 4.8 and Attachment 10. - Refer to Section 4.8, Section 5.1 and Attachment 10.
6	7-9 Gibbons St (Urba)	Building separation – The development infringes on the 8m Regent Street setback and the 18m separation required to help maintain privacy between it and Urba building	Refer to: Sections 4.3 and 4.8 and Attachment 1 Architectural Drawing Package
		- Solar access cut off to surrounding apartments on the eastern side, well below the minimum 2 hours of direct sunlight - Cuts out any ambient solar amenity	Refer to: Sections: 4.8 and shadow diagrams in Attachment 1 Architectural Drawing Package
		- All eastern views from Urba would be lost - Remaining southern views from 157 Redfern Street will be reduced	Refer to: Sections: 4.8 and Preliminary View Impact Analysis included in the Architectural Drawing Package at Attachment 1
		The loading dock could create chaos on William Lane and block access to 157 Redfern Street – the dramatic traffic increase will create a hazard to cars turning into William Lane and no traffic management solutions have been outlined	A Swept path analysis of the loading/waste bay is included at Attachment 12. Traffic generation, including along William Lane addressed in the EIS, Attachment 5 Traffic Assessment.
7	Unknown – Redfern, NSW	- Building separation between the development and Urba - View loss and solar amenity - Wind tunnel from proposal and Iglu Development	- Refer to Section 4.2.2 - Refer to Sections 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 - Refer to Section 4.7.4

		• Childcare centre drop off/parking • William Lane access and loading dock • Marion Street garbage collection • Construction hours	• Refer to Section 4.10.4 • Refer to Section 4.10.2 and EIS, Attachment 5 • Refer to Section 4.10.2 and EIS, Attachment 5 • Refer to Section 5.1
8	7-9 Gibbons Street, Redfern	• Solar access • Building separation between the development and Urban • Traffic congestion and disruption to William Lane by the proposed loading dock • Parking inadequacies with proposed childcare centre drop off/parking • Proposed construction hours are outside current regulations	• Refer to Section 4.7.2 • Refer to Sections 4.2.2 • Refer to Section 4.10.2 and EIS, Attachment 5 • Refer to Section 4.10.2 and EIS, Attachment 5 • Refer to Section 5.1
9	Carolyn Murray & Nicola Bath 122 Renwick St, Redfern	• Building height – blocks sun access • Rooftop noise • Lack of green open space for recreational and leisure activities • Impact on public services • Crane noise	• Refer to Sections 4.1 and 4.7.2 • Refer to Sections 4.7.5 • Communal open space provided on roof-top in excess of requirements – Refer to Section 4.4.2 • Section 94A contributions will be levied on the development to assist in funding public facilities • Refer to Sections 4.7.5 and 5.1
10	Irene Doutney	• Impacts on indigenous Aboriginal community • General height and setback non-compliances • Affordability of childcare centre • Affordable housing contribution should be increased • Public transport contribution	• The existing buildings are commercial premises and their redevelopment is unlikely to impact on the Aboriginal community. An Aboriginal Archaeological Due Diligence Desktop Assessment was provided with the EIS (Attachment 22) which found that the archaeological potential of the subject site is low to nil, it is therefore considered that the subject site does not have any identified significance to Aboriginal cultural heritage and archaeology. • Refer to Section 4.1 and 4.2 • Refer to Section 4.12 • There is no plan in place for the site for contributions to public transport. This is outside the scope of the applicable contributions plans.
11	Melissa Shannon	• Building separation between the development and Urban • View loss and solar amenity • Childcare centre drop off/parking • William Lane access and loading dock	• Refer to Section 4.2.2 • Refer to Sections 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 • Refer to Section 4.7.4 • Refer to Section 4.10.4

		• Marion St garbage collection – loss of a number of short stay, off street parking along Marion St • Construction hours – at odds with Iglu development • Use of high noise plant and equipment	• Refer to Section 4.10.2 and EIS, Attachment 5 • Refer to Section 5.1 • Refer to Section 4.7.5
12	Minnie Shao 608/7-9 Gibbons Street, Redfern	• Building separation between the development and Urba • View loss and solar amenity • Childcare centre drop off/parking • William Lane access and loading dock • Marion Street garbage collection • Construction hours	• Refer to Section 4.2.2 • Refer to Sections 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 • Refer to Section 4.10.4 • Refer to Section 4.10.2 and EIS, Attachment 5 • Refer to Section 4.10.2 and EIS, Attachment 5 • Refer to Section 5.1
13	Pang Kwong Woo	• View loss • Access to sunlight • Block ventilation of the neighbouring building • Building separation • Building height • Noise impacts	• Refer to Section 4.7.1 • Refer to Sections 4.7.2 • Refer to Section 4.2.2 • Refer to Section 4.2.2 • Refer to Section 4.1 • Refer to Section 4.7.5
14	Peter Hudson 1409/7-9 Gibbons St, Redfern	• Lost heritage look and feel of Regent Street	• Addressed in the EIS, Attachment 21 Heritage Impact Statement.
15	Peter Sievert	• Impact on southerly views • Obstruction of Marion Street and entrance to neighbouring building • Setback laws overlooked	• Refer to Section 4.7.1 • No obstruction to Marian Street or entrances to adjoining buildings • Setbacks- Refer to Section 4.2
16	Ryan Lee	• Too close to neighbouring Urba building • Too many complexes in a very small area • Not enough public facilities to accommodate so many residences	• Setbacks- Refer to Section 4.2 • The controls under SEPP (SSP) envisage a building of the scale proposed on site. • Section 94A contributions will be levied on the development to assist in funding public facilities
17	Sam Shannon	• Building separation • View loss and solar amenity • Childcare centre drop off/parking • William Lane access and loading dock • Marion Street garbage collection • Construction hours • Restrictions applied to the Iglu development – proposed development hours of operation are outside those for the Iglu development	• Refer to Section 4.2.2 • Refer to Section 4.7.1 • Refer to Section 4.10.4 • Refer to Section 4.10.2 and EIS, Attachment 5 • Refer to Section 4.10.2 and EIS, Attachment 5 • Refer to Section 5.1 • Standard hours of operation proposed for the child care centre.

18	Yi Shen	- Setback infringement – building separation - Privacy issues - Cut off southern views - Construction hours	- Refer to Section 4.2.2 - Refer to Section 4.7.3 - Refer to Section 4.7.1 - Refer to Section 5.1
19	Juliana Jo	- View impacts - Lack of direct sunlight to all east facing apartments - Lack of privacy due to encroachment - Building separation - Traffic and parking issues - Change of historical urban landscape in Redfern	- Refer to Section 4.7.1 - Refer to Sections 4.7.2 - Refer to Section 4.7.3 - Refer to Section 4.2.2 - Addressed in EIS, Attachment 5 Traffic Assessment. - Addressed in EIS, Attachment 21 Heritage Impact Statement.
20	Stephen Sim	- Overdevelopment of the site - Building height - Solar amenity - Loss of privacy - Increased traffic and ongoing parking issues	- The proposal complies with FSR Refer to Section 4.3 - Refer to Section 4.1 - Refer to Section 4.4.2 and 4.7.3 - Refer to Section 4.7.2 - Refer to Section 4.7.3 - Addressed in EIS, Attachment 5 Traffic Assessment
21	Residents of Iglu (C/o JBA)	- Building height non-compliant - Minimal setback/building separation from proposed balconies and windows on northern elevation to southern elevation of Iglu development. - Privacy impacts arising from proposed balconies and windows on northern elevation - Visual impacts - Wind impacts - Construction of property boundary	- Refer to Section 4.1 - Refer to Section 4.2 - Refer to Section 4.7.3 - Refer to Section 4.7.1 - Refer to Section 4.7.4 - Refer to Section 5.1
22	90-96 Regent St, Redfern (C/o DMPS)	- Road widening – Marion Street - The non-compliance with 4m tower setback to Marian Street will result in ADG non-compliant separation distances to future development to the south at 90-96 Regent Street. - Compromised solar access and privacy to any future development at 90-96 Regent Street to due to reduced setbacks /separation distances. - Ground level setback: the proposal does not comply with the 1.5m setback to Marian Street and the 0.8m setback to William applying under the Draft Urban Design Guidelines (Redfern Centre)	- Ground an first level setback to Marian Street increased by 1.5m - Refer to Section 4.2.1 - Refer to Sections 4.2.1, 4.2.2 – predominant setback to Marian Street increased to 3.15m. - Refer to Sections 4.2.1, 4.2.2 and 4.7.2 - Setbacks to Marian Street increased by 1.5m and 0.8m to William Lane
23	Unknown	- Inconsistent with local character - Will local infrastructure support increased population	- The building is consistent with the scale of adjacent buildings – Refer to X - Section 94A contributions will be levied on the development to assist in funding public infrastructure.



24	Unknown	• <i>Separation distances - These 4 towers are too close and do not meet the minimum set back requirements.</i> • <i>No affordable housing</i> • <i>An recycling/waste room needs to be included.</i> • <i>Not enough storage for each apartment, nor for common property storage.</i> • <i>No building managers office. No meeting room for owners.</i> • <i>Not enough space on the street for drop off parking for the child care centre</i> • <i>No solar panels</i> • <i>The scale is wrong for the size of the land- too tall and skinny. Needs to be lower height so that there is some variance with the surrounding blocks</i> • <i>Exterior finishes and design is like a boring box</i>	• Building separation - Refer to Section 4.2 • Affordable housing contribution will be provided – Refer to Section 4.12 • Waste facilities provided – Refer to Section X • Adequate storage is provided consistent with ADG – Refer to X • Communal space could be used for meeting spaces. • Solar panels – while the proposal does not include solar panels, it incorporates a number of sustainably initiatives – Refer to X. • Child care drop -off – Section X • The controls under SEPP (SSP) envisage a building of the scale proposed on site • Materials and finishes – Refer to X
----	---------	--	---